## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-20 and 32-51 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 32, and 42 are independent. In the Office Action dated June 24, 2009, Claims 12 and 16 were objected to, Claims 1, 32, and 42 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10-13, 16-21, 32-36, 38-42, 44-46, 48-49 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and Claims 2, 4, 8-9, 14-15, 7, 43, 47, and 50 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-20 and 32-51 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

### I.    Information Disclosure Statements

The undersigned requests the Examiner to return copies of the 1449 Forms filed with the Eighteenth Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement on June 22, 2009 and Nineteenth Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement on July 30, 2009, marked as being considered and initialed by the Examiner, with the next official communication.

### II.    Rejection of the Claims Under the Doctrine of Double Patenting

In the Office Action dated June 24, 2009, the Examiner provisionally rejected Claims 1, 32, and 42 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 42 of copending U.S. Patent Application No. 12/028,797. The Examiner has stated that a timely filed Terminal Disclaimer in

17

compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome this rejection. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner hold this rejection in abeyance until allowable subject matter has been indicated.

III.    Objection to the Claims

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 12 and 16 as containing various informalities. Claims 12 and 16 have been amended to address these informalities and do not narrow the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this objection and add no new matter.

IV.    Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10-13, 16-21, 32-36, 38-42, 44-46, 48-49 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0039142 ("*Jalon*"). In addition the Examiner rejected dependent Claims 2, 4, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jalon*, dependent Claims 8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jalon* in view of Microsoft Outlook Screen Dumps ("*MS Outlook*"), dependent Claims 9, 37, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jalon* in view of *MS Outlook* and U.S. Patent No. 5,943,051 ("*Onda*"), and dependent Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jalon* in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,039,596 ("*Lu*"). Claims 1, 32, and 42 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "wherein displaying each selected calendar in the view frame simultaneously comprises displaying the first selected calendar associated with the first user in the side-by-side orientation with each selected shared calendar associated with the at least one second user." Amended Claims 32 and 42 each include a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 2, line 5 – page 3, line 30.

In contrast, *Jalon* does not disclose displaying a first user's calendar in a side-by-side orientation with a second user's calendar at a same position within each user's calendar. For example, *Jalon* merely discloses displaying a primary date range. (See *Jalon* paragraph [0034]; Figure 3.) *Jalon's* primary date range comprises a day with a data field for each hour, or alternatively, *Jalon's* primary data range may be a month. (See *Jalon* paragraph [0034]; Figure 3.) A selector in *Jalon* enables a user to select which primary data range to display. (*See Jalon* paragraph [0034]; Figure 3.) The Examiner contends that displaying a 'February' calendar, displayed in a 'month' date range, with a 'January' calendar, also displayed in a 'month' date range, corresponds to displaying multiple calendars simultaneously at a same position. (*See Jalon* Figure 3.) Applicants respectfully submit that because the January and February calendars do not correspond to the same month, they cannot correspond to the same calendar position as claimed, or 'date range'. Moreover, the calendar display disclosed by *Jalon* in Figure 3 does not correspond to an aggregate view frame as claimed. Rather, *Jalon's* calendar display corresponds to two separate view frames. (*See Jalon* Figure 3.)

However still, even if the Examiner's contentions were true, nowhere does *Jalon*, *MS Outlook*, *Onda*, or *Lu* disclose a simultaneous, side-by-side calendar display corresponding to different users. For example, referring to Figure 3 of the present application, multiple calendars are each: i) displayed in a side-by-side orientation simultaneously within a single view frame; ii) associated with different users; and iii) positioned at the same date. In contrast, referring to Figure 3 of *Jalon*, multiple calendars are displayed in two separate view frames, positioned at two different months, and correspond to the same user. Accordingly, neither *Jalon* nor *MS Outlook*, *Onda*, or *Lu* disclose displaying a first user's calendar in a side-by-side orientation with a second user's calendar at a same position within each user's calendar.

Combing *Jalon* with *MS Outlook*, *Onda*, and *Lu* would not have led to the claimed subject matter because *Jalon*, *MS Outlook*, *Onda*, and *Lu*, either individually or in any reasonable combination, at least do not disclose "wherein displaying each selected calendar in the view frame simultaneously comprises displaying the first selected calendar associated with the first user in the side-by-side orientation with each selected shared calendar associated with the at least one second user," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 32 and 42 each include a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 32, and 42 each patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 32, and 42.

Dependent Claims 2-20, 33-41, and 43-51 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 32, and 42, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 32, and 42. Accordingly,

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-20, 33-41, and 43-51.

V.    Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date:  September 24, 2009

_____
D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

21